

Appl. No. 10/023,196
Amendment and/or Response
Reply to Office action of 8/25/2004

Page 7 of 10

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1-15 are pending. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Kasahara et al. (2002/0036650 A1). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because Kasahara et al. fail to disclose each and every feature of the claims as required by 35 U.S.C. 102(e). Accordingly, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Applicants first note that in the Office Action, the Office mistakenly identified applicants' arguments of 01/09/2004 in the "Response to Arguments." Applicants assume the Office mistakenly replaced the date 05/05/2004 (RCE of 06/21/2004) with 01/09/2004 by a typographic error and applicants therefore respond under this assumption. Clarification, however, is respectfully requested.

Kasahara fails to disclose each and every claimed feature of the present invention. For example, claim 1 includes, among other features, a "determining means for determining a display load of the device and for comparing the display load of the device with a threshold value," and "control means for dynamically reducing a number of sub-fields available for display of an image responsive to said determined display load being below the threshold value." Claim 14

Atty. Docket No. NL000736

Appl. No. 10/023,196
Amendment and/or Response
Reply to Office action of 8/25/2004

Page 8 of 10

includes similar features. These features of the current invention "[allow] for an increased light output at low display loads ... without exceeding the maximum power load for the sustain power supply." (See page 1 of the Application.) In the Kasahara et al. system, a peak level detector 26 and an average level detector 28 determine the peak level and average level of brightness. (See page 7, paragraph 0106.) The peak level and the average level are then processed by an image characteristic determining device 30 to determine "4 parameters: N-times mode value N; fixed multiplication factor A of a multiplier 12; subfield number Z; and gradation display point number K[.]" (Page 7, paragraph 0107). However, Kasahara et al. do not disclose a threshold value for the peak (or average) level and do not disclose comparing the peak (or average) level with the threshold value. The Kasahara et al. system might be able to assign each specific peak (or average) value with a specific subfield number Z, but that does not mean they have a threshold. A threshold is "a minimum requirement for further action, specifically, a determination upon which something else hinges." (Merriam-Webster Dictionary of Law). In Kasahara et al., no such minimum requirement of peak (or average) level is disclosed. By sharp contrast, the current invention includes "dynamically reducing a number of sub-fields available for display of an image responsive to said determined display load being below the threshold value."

Atty. Docket No. NL000736

**Appl. No. 10/023,196
Amendment and/or Response
Reply to Office action of 8/25/2004**

Page 9 of 10

In addition, Kasahara et al. does not disclose "dynamically reducing a number of sub-fields available for display of an image responsive to said determined display load being below the threshold value." In Kasahara et al., "each time the peak level Lpk drops, and the column changes, the **subfield number Z either remains the same or increases[.]**" (Page 9, Paragraph 0126). In Kasahara et al., increase of subfield number Z works together with changes of weighting multiplier N and multiplication factor A to ensure that "a gradational change of brightness does not occur." Id. Obviously, Kasahara et al. are providing a total different solution than the one of the current invention.

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully submit that Kasahara et al. do not anticipate the current invention.

Atty. Docket No. NL000736

Appl. No. 10/023,196
Amendment and/or Response
Reply to Office action of 8/25/2004

Page 10 of 10

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

 11/19/04

Michael F. Hoffman
Reg. No. 40,019
Attorney for Applicants

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
Three E-Comm Square
Albany, NY 12207
Phone: (518) 449-0044
Fax: (518) 449-0047

Atty. Docket No. NL000736